DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 634 EC 303 461

AUTHOR	Lombardi, Thomas P.
TITLE	Responsible Inclusion of Students with Disabilities: Fastback 373.
INSTITUTION	Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Ind.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-87367-373-5
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	42p.; This fastback is sponsored by the Tampa Florida Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa.
AVAILABLE FROM	Phi Delta Kappa, 408 N. Union, P.O. Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402-0789 ($1.25 single copy, quantity discount).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; *Disabilities; Educational Change; *Educational Methods; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inclusive Schools; *Mainstreaming; Regular and Special Education Relationship; Social Integration; Student Placement; Teacher Role; Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS	Teacher Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This pamphlet provides an overview of the philosophical, legal, and research bases of responsible inclusion of students with disabilities in regular classes. Educators are urged to not disregard the continuum of service placement, which is legally required, but to recognize that most students with disabilities can be educated in regular classes in their home schools, provided that they have appropriate support systems. Four educational approaches effective for students with disabilities are described: direct instruction, the Strategy Intervention Model, teacher assistance teams, and the Vermont Consulting Teacher Model. The need for teachers, administrators, and other school personnel to receive training to learn new skills and to accept new roles is discussed. The importance of consultation and collaboration are noted, along with the need for modifications in curricula, methods of instruction, and materials. Checklists are presented for administrators, teachers, and parents to assess their inclusion philosophy. (Contains 28 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EC

373 FASTBACK®

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Responsible Inclusion of Students with Disabilities

Thomas P. Lombardi

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donovan Walling

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 376 634

EC 303 [illegible]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PHI DELTA KAPPA EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

THOMAS P. LOMBARDI

Thomas P. Lombardi is professor of special education at West Virginia University. Previously he was an assistant professor at the University of Arizona, director of education and training at the Arizona Children's Colony, and a special educator in Connecticut.

Lombardi received his Ed.D. in special education from the University of Arizona, M.Ed. in rehabilitation counseling from Springfield College, and B.S. in special and regular education from Southern Connecticut State University. He has done post-doctoral study in learning strategies at the University of Kansas and in special education technology at the University of Kentucky.

Lombardi has published widely in education journals. He is the author of *Career Adaptive Behavior Inventory, Special Students and Our Schools* and *ITPA: Clinical Interpretation and Remediation*. He also is the author of fastback 345 *Learning Strategies for Problem Learners*. A certified Strategy Intervention Model trainer, he provides training, workshops, and consultation for schools and industry.

Lombardi was named Outstanding Teacher three times by the West Virginia University College of Human Resources and Education and in 1989 was a finalist for the West Virginia Professor of the Year Award. Active in a number of professional organizations, he has received both leadership and research awards from the West Virginia University Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa.

Series Editor, Donovan R. Walling

Responsible Inclusion of Students with Disabilities

by
Thomas P. Lombardi

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 94-67119
ISBN 0-87367-373-5
Copyright © 1994 by the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana

This fastback is sponsored by the Tampa Florida Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, which made a generous contribution toward publication costs.

The chapter sponsors this fastback to honor the teachers in special education, whose devotion and guidance have opened the world of learning to children with special needs.

Table of Contents

Introduction 7
A Word of Caution 9

The Basis for Inclusion 10
Legal Mandates 10
Moral Principles 12

Research 14

Models 16
Direct Instruction 16
Strategy Intervention Model 18
Teacher Assistance Team 19
Vermont Consulting Teacher Model 21

Education and Training 23
Teacher Training 23
Administrator Training 24
Training Other Professionals 25

New Roles and Responsibilities 26
Consultation 26
Collaboration 27

Modifying Instruction 30
Curricula 30
Methods of Instruction 31
Materials 32

Inclusion Checklists 34

References 37

Introduction

As early as the 1960s, I was involved in a federal project to prepare school personnel to meet the needs of students with disabilities in regular classes. Since then, a number of concepts and mandates have emerged under such labels as *normalization, mainstreaming, least restrictive environment,* and *integrated education.* The latest and perhaps most comprehensive label is *inclusion.*

There is no single, universally accepted definition for inclusion. However, it is generally agreed that inclusion involves a commitment to educate each student with a disability in the school and, when appropriate, in the class that child would have attended had the child not had a disability. The guiding principle behind inclusion is to bring the services to the student, rather than the student to the services. All faculty and administrators have as much responsibility in the education and training of students with disabilities as they do with students who do not have formally diagnosed disabilities.

Professional and parent associations, including the Council for Exceptional Children, the Learning Disabilities Association, and the National School Boards Association, have developed position papers on the inclusion movement. Most are cautiously optimistic about the positive potential of inclusion.

Much of the research on inclusion has demonstrated that it has benefits for students with disabilities. These students show significant, consistent educational achievements and increased affective skills when educated in inclusive classrooms.

However, critics of inclusion caution that such positive results have been reported from only pilot programs. These critics argue that regular schools may not provide the careful monitoring associated with specially funded inclusion projects and thus might not produce the same benefits for their disabled students. These same critics also warn against total inclusion for all students with disabilities. They caution against abandoning the current continuum of service placements that allows responsible educators to make individualized decisions about the education of disabled students.

With or without funded projects, inclusion is becoming the norm, rather than the exception. As the movement grows, school systems are offering inservice programs to prepare administrators and teachers for their new responsibilities. Collaboration, consultation, cooperative learning, team teaching, peer tutoring, behavior support plans, curriculum adaptations, and environmental accommodations are just a few of the support strategies that need to be instituted in all schools.

Increasing numbers of schools and colleges of education are requiring future teachers and administrators to have both coursework and hands-on experience with students who have disabilities. A 1993 West Virginia Department of Education survey found that 16 of the 18 teacher training programs in that state required all of their teacher trainees to take a course in special education prior to graduation. Some states, such as Maryland, have mandated a course in special education for all teachers.

This fastback provides an overview of the philosophical, legal, and research bases of *responsible* inclusion. I believe that inclusion has as much to do with a school's philosophy as it does with specific placement. Educators should not disregard the continuum of service placements, which is legally required, but should recognize that most students with disabilities can be educated in regular classes in their home schools, provided that they have appropriate support systems. This fastback includes practical suggestions and strategies for implementing inclusion and describes specific examples of how adminis-

trators, regular teachers, special teachers, and parents can work as a team to support an inclusive school and integrated education for students with disabilities. In addition, a series of checklists is included so that administrators, teachers, and parents can see how they are meeting the intent of the inclusion movement.

A Word of Caution

Responsible inclusion requires careful planning and adequate support before any student with disabilities is placed in a regular class. Both regular and special teachers must be trained properly for their new responsibilities, and that involves more than just changing their titles to "collaborators" or "consultants." It involves learning skills that are not often taught in teacher training programs.

The student's individual education program must be developed before any decision is made on the student's placement. For example, a student who is suddenly blinded may need to be placed in a special class or special school to learn orientation skills before returning to a regular class; but returning to or never leaving the regular class is the basis of inclusion.

Responsible inclusion is hard work. But it may prevent many students with disabilities from becoming handicapped.

The Basis for Inclusion

The basis for inclusion can be found in both legal mandates and moral principles. However, once inclusion is established in a school, it will be up to educators to make appropriate decisions about individual students with disabilities. A disabled student may be assigned to a regular class but not truly accepted or included. Or a student may receive all or part of his instruction in a special class and yet be fully accepted by others and included as a full member of the school community. Ideally, the disabled students should be both physically and socially included in the life of the school and the activities of its students.

Legal Mandates

Educating disabled students with their nondisabled peers was one of the major principles of the Education for Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), now renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (P.L. 101-476). (See fastback 360 *Implementing the Disabilities Acts: Implications for Educators*.) How to accomplish inclusion is still being addressed in the courts. Three recent cases are worth noting.

Sacramento City Unified School District v. *Holland* concerned Rachel Holland's school placement. Her parents wanted Rachel, a student with a moderate level of mental retardation, to be placed full

time in regular classes. The school administration disagreed. Both parties were in total agreement on the objectives of Rachel's Individual Education Plan (IEP). Although the IEP emphasized socialization skills, the school administration voiced concern that functional skills – doing laundry, counting money, and so on – would be difficult to implement in a regular class even with modifications. However, these functional skills had not been addressed adequately in developing the IEP. Thus the court ruled in favor of the parents, because the objective of socialization could be met in the regular class.

In the case of *Greer* v. *Rome City Schools*, the court ruled that the full range of service configurations was not considered in a placement decision regarding Christy Greer, a 10-year-old with Down syndrome. The school administration believed that Christy's program would best be delivered in a self-contained classroom, and they presented her parents with a proposed IEP prior to the formal IEP meeting. Christy's parents preferred the regular classroom plus specialized speech therapy and so disagreed with the proposed IEP. The court determined that the IEP should have been developed at a meeting by a multidisciplinary team that included the parents and, if feasible, the student.

Unlike Rachel and Christy, Rafael Oberti presented behavior problems. In *Oberti* v. *Clementon School District*, Rafael had experienced a number of different educational placements in the schools. Under a more restricted special class environment with a behavior modification program, his behavior was manageable. When placed in a regular class, his behavior was not manageable. Although the school administration claimed to have considered all placement options for Rafael, the court ruled that they had not. They may have considered all of *their* current placement options, but not all *potential* options. It was felt that the behavior management program offered in the special education class was sufficiently portable to be used in a regular class.

These cases have one key feature in common: The courts gave more consideration to the needs and goals identified in each student's IEP

than to actual placement. Placement, by law, follows development of the IEP.

Other legal factors that have been considered in inclusion rulings include the long-term benefits to the student, any detrimental effects a disabled student may have on the education of students without disabilities in the regular classroom, and the costs of establishing or maintaining an inclusive education program for the student. Although the term *inclusion* is not used in any of the current federal acts, the term *least restrictive environment* is used. Thus regular-class placement must be considered seriously before any other placement is made. Removal of disabled students from regular classes should occur only when the special needs cannot be met even with the use of supportive services, teaching adaptations, and curriculum modifications.

Moral Principles

It has been 25 years since Lloyd Dunn wrote his classic article, "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded: Is Much of It Justifiable?" (Dunn 1968). In it he states that "by removing students with disabilities from regular classes we contribute to the delinquency of regular education. We reduce the need for regular teachers to deal with individual differences. It is morally and educationally wrong" (p. 20).

Students with disabilities have a right to be educated with their peers in integrated settings. To deny them this right is a form of discrimination. Students who are educated in separate classes often feel unmotivated, inferior, and helpless.

Recently I heard someone talk about a "tolerance theory" of inclusion. The implications were that some regular teachers have a greater tolerance range than others toward accepting students with disabilities in their classroom. This no doubt is true. However, the education of students with disabilities is too important to be left to teachers' choices of whom they will or will not accept in their classes.

Needing assistance, training, materials, and guidance is understandable; arbitrary refusal to accept students with disabilities is not.

One of the criticisms of inclusion is that it could have a detrimental effect on the learning progress of students who are not disabled. Actually, the opposite is more likely. As teachers begin to individualize instruction to accommodate the student with special needs, other students, particularly those considered at risk, also will benefit from the accompanying support systems. Studies of students at risk (Frymier and Gansneder 1989; Lombardi, Odell, and Novotny 1991) indicate that the kinds of support systems needed by such students are similar to those needed by students with disabilities. Having the benefit of both a special teacher and a regular teacher collaborating in a regular class is morally and educationally sound because such collaboration focuses on children's needs, not on their labels.

Segregated settings do not prepare students to live in an integrated society. Responsible inclusion does. Conversely, responsible inclusion does not leave students in regular programs and classes without the necessary support systems to meet their needs.

Research

Although the literature abounds with mission statements, philosophies, theories, principles, opinions, perceptions, and guidelines, there are few studies of the efficacy of inclusion for the broad range of students who are eligible for special education. Most information is in the form of case studies. Since programs for students with special needs should be individualized, perhaps this is as it should be. Following are some noteworthy studies:

Halvorsen and Sailor (1990) reviewed 261 studies that compared special needs students in integrated placements with their peers in segregated placements. They concluded that the students in the integrated programs more often reduced inappropriate behaviors, increased communication skills, exhibited greater independence, and engendered higher parental expectations.

The Learning Together Project (Corbin 1991), conducted in east central Minnesota, targeted students in five elementary schools for full inclusion in general education classrooms. Previously these students had been educated in segregated classrooms. As a result of the new placement, parents reported greater growth in both academic and social learning. Teachers found that the regular education students maintained their academic performance, were understanding and accepting of the disabled students, and became role models for the students with disabilities.

The Ravenswood Project (Lombardi, Nuzzo, Kennedy, and Foshay 1994) assessed the perceptions of 36 teachers, 96 parents, and 232 students regarding an integrated high school inclusion program. All groups were supportive of the program. Positive results included a decrease in dropout rates for students with disabilities, fewer classroom disturbances, and reasonable academic gains. Of the 36 students who had been in resource rooms and special classes, all preferred the regular classroom placement over their previous placement.

A related study of the cost-effectiveness of inclusion was conducted in Madison, Wisconsin. Piuma (1989) found that over a 15-year period, the employment rate for high school graduates with special needs who had been in segregated programs was 53%. But for special needs graduates from integrated programs, the employment rate was 73%. The cost of educating students in segregated programs was double that for educating them in integrated programs. These findings are similar to those of a study by Affleck, Madge, Adams, and Lowenbraun (1988), who demonstrated that the integrated classroom program for students with special needs was more cost-effective than the resource program, even though achievement in reading, math, and language remained basically the same in the two service delivery systems.

Models

A growing number of research reports focus on specific educational approaches and their relationship to the inclusion movement. The Research Triangle Institute (1993) developed a comprehensive overview of 16 carefully selected and well-documented programs that are effective for students with disabilities. Program models include: the High/Scope Curriculum, Strategy Intervention Model (SIM), Tactics for Thinking, direct instruction, mastery learning, learning styles, SUCCESS, student team learning, classwide student tutoring teams, adaptive learning environments, Vermont Consulting Teacher Model, teacher assistance teams, Project RIDE, North Carolina Lead Team Model, Comprehensive Local School, and Coalition of Essential Schools.

Four of these models are described in this fastback, and each description includes a contact person for additional information.

Direct Instruction

Direct instruction has become a generic term to describe the structured teaching of academic and social behaviors. According to Becker, Englemann, Carnine, and Rhine (1981), direct instruction has eight major components: 1) focus on academic objectives, 2) additional teachers in the classroom, 3) structured use of time, 4) scripted presentation of lessons, 5) efficient teaching methods, 6) careful train-

ing and supervision, 7) monitoring of progress, and 8) active parent involvement. It has been used with students of various ages and abilities both in regular and special classes. Its use with students who have severe mental impairments has been limited.

Major cost items involved in using direct instruction are staff training, materials, a supervisor for every 50 to 100 teachers, and a classroom paraprofessional for kindergarten and first-grade classes.

Direct instruction classes look similar to traditional classes. However, direct instruction tends to be more systematic. If you walk into a direct instruction classroom, you might see the teacher working with a small group of seven or eight students, while the rest of the class does independent work. The teacher might tell everyone to "touch" column 5 in their workbook and say, "First, we are going to read all the words in this column. Then we are going to talk about those words." She then asks the class to repeat what they will be doing. She also calls on individuals to make sure they understand. This individualized attention is particularly helpful for students with special needs. After each correct response, she reinforces the behavior with a smile and verbal praise. Incorrect responses are corrected and the student is then asked the question again.

Some educators believe that direct instruction stifles creativity because it is a step-by-step, fast-paced, structured approach. However, recent research supports its use with large and small groups. White (1988), in a meta-analysis of 25 studies that compared direct instruction to other intervention programs for special needs students, found that 53% of the studies statistically found direct instruction to be the most effective teaching method.

For more information about direct instruction, contact:

Dr. Douglas Carnine, Co-Director
Direct Instruction Model Project
University of Oregon
805 Lincoln Street
Eugene, OR 97401
(503) 485-1163

or

Karen Sorrentino
DI Products
Science Research Associates
155 North Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(800) 722-5351

Strategy Intervention Model

The Strategy Intervention Model (SIM) was developed by Donald Deshler and his colleagues at the University of Kansas Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities. Using a cognitive orientation, they emphasized developing a learning-strategies curriculum that would allow students to better use their skills in acquiring content. Their original target population of adolescents with learning problems has been expanded to include other age groups and other problem areas.

The heart of the strategy is to teach students how to learn, not what to learn. To date, 16 different learning-strategy instructional programs have been developed. All of the strategies are contained in instructor manuals, many with accompanying student workbooks. At this time, these workbooks are available only to teachers who have participated in training by a certified SIM trainer. Several state education departments have contracted with the institute to prepare SIM trainers for their school systems.

Strategies that are part of the SIM curriculum include: word identification, word imagery, self-questioning, paraphrasing, interpreting visual aids, multipass, listening and taking notes, first-letter mnemonics, pair-associates, sentence writing, paragraph writing, error monitoring, assignment completion, and test taking. There is a recommended sequence for learning and using the strategies. Strategy instruction may be taught in a resource room, special class, or regular class.

A major goal of SIM is learning regular class content. Special and regular teachers work cooperatively to help students learn to use the strategies. If you were to visit a strategies classroom, you might see something like this:

As the teacher hands out a science test, special needs students are prompted to use PIRATES. They immediately write PIRATES and their name on the top of the test. PIRATES is a mnemonic for a SIM test-taking strategy. The acronym stands for: Prepare to succeed; Inspect the instructions; Read, remember, reduce; Answer or abandon; Turn back; Estimate; and Survey.

Next these students individualize the test by deciding the order in which they will answer the questions. They do this by writing a number beside each test section. One student may choose to complete the true-false section first; another may tackle the matching section. As a student proceeds, he may put a star beside an "abandoned" question to remind him to turn back to it later. At the end, the students go back and survey the entire test to make sure they completed it.

For more information about SIM, training requirements, and costs, contact:

Dr. Don Deshler
University of Kansas
Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities
Robert Dole Human Development Center
Lawrence, KS 66045-2342
(913) 854-4780

Teacher Assistance Team

Across the country, teacher assistance teams are being established so that teachers can better serve students with learning and behavior problems in regular classrooms. Typically, a teacher assistance team (TAT) comprises three or four school faculty members who meet – usually weekly – to help other teachers and staff solve problems.

Most of the problems relate to student needs, but they can be as diverse as grading practices or playground schedules.

The TAT model can be used at all school levels; it is not a replacement for special education. Multidisciplinary teams are required by law to determine if a student is eligible for special education; TATs are not required. But the TAT model can support and encourage inclusion by providing assistance to teachers who are trying to individualize instruction. TAT assistance also may include modifying the curriculum, developing a learning strategy, or implementing a behavior-modification program. In an analysis of five studies that included a total of 96 teacher assistance teams, Chalfant and Van Dusen Pysh (1989) found that 59% of the intervention goals addressed managing student behavior and 21% were for academic areas. The remaining 20% included problems in such areas as memory, speech, and motor performance.

TAT is not a typical consulting model, which usually involves giving advice one-on-one. Teacher assistance teams are a collaborative arrangement, where the referring teacher can turn to a team to help solve a problem. One of the first things a team should ask the referring teacher is, "How can we help you?"

An effective TAT requires administrative and faculty commitment, including time to meet and TAT training in analyzing problems, brainstorming, communication, and developing interventions. Some TAT programs rotate team members so that each teacher eventually gets to serve on a team. Some also invite the parents to serve on the team.

For training information and materials about TAT, contact:

Dr. James Chalfant
College of Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
(602) 621-3214

Vermont Consulting Teacher Model

The consulting teacher model (CTM) was used in a number of states even prior to the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142). Its basic principle is to help regular education teachers improve their skills in teaching special students. The most noted consulting model is associated with the state of Vermont.

The Vermont model originally was designed to provide direct services to teachers and other service givers and only indirect services to students with disabilities. In addition, all students, regardless of the severity of their disabilities, were to be taught in regular classes. Very few schools use this "total inclusion" design. Rather, most of the school systems using the CTM model give greater emphasis to collaboration and team teaching. This new collaborative emphasis is being supported by the Vermont Department of Education.

Teachers are trained as consulting teachers at St. Michael's College and the University of Vermont. Those who graduate from these programs are prepared to: 1) provide consultation and assistance to teachers with disabled students in regular classes, 2) guide paraprofessionals who provide support to disabled students in regular classes, and 3) team teach in regular classes, resource rooms, or special classes.

The Vermont Consulting Teacher Model lists a wide range of competencies expected from their consulting teachers besides effective consultation skills. These include: providing inservice programs to parents and teachers, developing parent support groups, assessing students for disabilities, suggesting appropriate interventions, evaluating interventions, and overseeing program effectiveness.

In Vermont, many schools include students on Individual Education Plan (IEP) committees. Many of these students are trained by consulting teachers to become advocates for their peers who have disabilities. One process that guides this training is the McGill Action Planning System (Snow and Forest 1987). MAPS teaches how to support peers, family members, and educators in order to integrate the disabled student in the school and community.

For additional information about the Vermont Consulting Teacher Model, contact:

Susan Hasazi
Graduate Programs in Special Education
College of Education and Social Services
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT 05405
(802) 656-2936

Education and Training

Responsible inclusion will require many teachers and administrators to learn new skills and to accept new roles. No longer will the major responsibility for the education of students with disabilities rest solely with the special teacher. More and more states are requiring special education training in general teacher and administrator certification programs.

Teacher Training

In the very near future, all teachers will be expected to know about the special needs of students with learning problems, including students who have disabilities. They also will be expected to modify instruction to better meet these needs. Collaboration and consultation with other personnel, especially the resource teacher, will be an everyday occurrence. Team teaching, peer tutoring, and cooperative learning will become part of their teaching practices.

In anticipation of these requirements, teacher training programs are being reorganized and new inservice requirements are being introduced in schools. Collaboration and cooperative teaching at the college level are becoming the "very essence of learning" (Katz 1987). Many programs that started as pilot projects are being incorporated into quality teacher training. An example is the Benedum Project at the College of Human Resources and Education at West Virginia

University. Starting in the 1994-95 academic year, all students seeking teacher certification will take not only coursework associated with students with disabilities but also field and student-teaching experiences before they finish their new five-year degree in education.

Special education teachers also will be trained differently. As our schools become more inclusive, special education teachers will more often function as resource persons and facilitators. Their responsibilities will extend beyond direct instruction to solving problems for the faculty. Categorical teacher certification probably will continue, but only in categories of severe disability or particular special learning needs. Students in these categories, for the most part, will be physically and socially integrated, even when they cannot be academically integrated. The majority of training programs in special education will be noncategorical, with emphasis on special resource teachers providing consultation to and collaboration with general educators and parents. Teacher training programs in Vermont, Massachusetts, and Idaho already have implemented broad-based practices to support successful inclusion.

Administrator Training

Effective inclusion will be impossible to achieve without the support of school administrators. For example, principals must be able to identify teachers who will be successful on inclusion teams, support parent involvement and training, encourage alternative curricula, and develop successful options for graduation. They must allow time for team planning and problem solving. (As a recent consultant to the Ravenswood Project, I found that the main concern of teachers about the inclusion process was time for team planning.)

All administrators need training, particularly at the preservice level, in special education law. This knowledge is needed for two reasons: 1) to ensure that students with special needs receive an appropriate education as required by law and 2) to minimize the potential for inappropriate due-process procedures by parents and other advocates.

A study by Valesky and Hirth (1992) found that no state certification requirement for basic knowledge of special education exists in 45% of administrative endorsements. This oversight needs to be corrected. On a more positive note, these researchers found that 75% of the states annually offer inservice training programs in special education for school administrators.

In all likelihood, the need for special education administrators will continue, although their responsibilities will be somewhat altered. They will be less involved with direct supervision and evaluation and more involved with consultation and collaboration. Their formal training will most likely be a special education endorsement on a general education administrator's certificate.

Training Other Professionals

Speech therapists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, and other service providers will witness a change in how they deliver services in inclusive schools. Rather than take the student with special needs out of the classroom for extended periods of time, they will be required to adapt their therapy to the regular classroom environment. They also will use collaboration and consultation to a greater degree. They will give suggestions to teachers and parents on guiding the therapy process in class and at home.

The role of the school counselor will be especially important if inclusion programs are to be effective. Counselors need to assist disabled students with personal and social concerns, as special and regular education merge into integrated education.

These changing roles will require modifications in training service providers. A model of such modification is adaptive physical education training as a program designed to keep students with disabilities in the mainstream with their nondisabled peers. Interestingly, the organizers of Special Olympics are now re-evaluating their programs in order to promote the integration of persons with and without mental retardation (Block and Moon 1992).

New Roles and Responsibilities

To be effective, responsible inclusion will require consultation and collaboration. A major difference between these two roles is the degree of responsibility for direct service to students with disabilities. Consultants provide information and guidance; they usually have specialized knowledge in such areas as behavior management, physical interventions, and communication development. Collaborators share teaching and training responsibilities. They usually know how to use and, when necessary, how to modify teaching and testing practices to accommodate a broad range of learning levels and styles. Often these two services are combined into a collaborative consultation model.

Consultation

A number of professionals may serve as consultants to regular teachers who have disabled students. These include physical therapists, speech clinicians, and special educators. Consultants observe in the classroom, collect data on the student or teacher performance, suggest intervention strategies, model interventions, and monitor intervention effects. Since consultants are not available on a daily basis, they must train teachers or paraprofessionals to take responsibility for the intervention plan. They do not solve problems directly, but rather help teachers improve skills and become more effective. Consul-

tants must be skilled in interpersonal relations if their assistance is to be accepted.

Examples of how consultation operates both for group and individual problems can be found in Lorna Idol-Maestas' *Special Educator's Consultation Handbook* (1983). Idol-Maestas describes the case of Kenny, a third-grade student with behavior problems that include roaming the classroom, leaving the classroom without permission, arguing with other students, and not completing modified assignments. The special education consultant focused on attention problems in Kenny's disruptive behavior and for eight days observed and recorded his attending/non-attending behaviors using time samples. Positive and negative teacher attention also was observed and recorded.

As a result, the consultant and teacher explained classroom rules to Kenny. Afterward, teacher praise and tokens were awarded when Kenny displayed appropriate behaviors. For the first few days, the consultant modeled the token-economy program; and then the regular teacher took over as the consultant observed. Kenny's attending behavior increased to 67.2% of observed intervals, which was an increase of 39.95% over baseline conditions. Teacher praise increased to an average of 20% of observed intervals, and negative behavior was reduced by one-half.

Collaboration

Whereas consultation is based on a single-expert model, collaboration relies on two or more people sharing their expertise. In most cases a collaborative effort involves a regular teacher and a special education teacher. However, collaboration may involve more than two people and include administrators, counselors, parents, and relevant others. Planning together takes time and the coordination of schedules. Administrators can be supportive by rearranging schedules, providing incentives, and making necessary resources available. These resources often include substitute teachers for collaborative team members. Most teachers, including special education teachers,

have not been trained to work collaboratively and thus need inservice training.

Some school systems actually designate someone to serve as an "integration collaborator." The collaborator's duties might include: promoting heterogeneous grouping, broadening the regular curriculum for different learning rates and styles, team teaching, guiding cooperative learning groups, arranging for peer tutoring, and expanding the collaborative effort beyond the classroom.

When two or more people solve problems, the chance for successful integration of students with disabilities is much greater. In addition, students without an identified disability indicate that they also benefit from having more than one teacher in the classroom (Lombardi, Nuzzo, Kennedy, and Foshay 1994). Through collaboration, individualized instruction, once a hallmark of special education, becomes available to all students.

Morgantown High School in Morgantown, West Virginia, provides an example of collaboration in action. As the English teacher, Mr. Hohmann, was lecturing the class on the role of the sender and receiver in following directions in the communication process, Mrs. Lundeen, a special educator, paraphrased some of his comments by writing potentially unfamiliar words on the blackboard. These included such words as *parallel*, *median*, and *exact*. She then reviewed these words with the entire class. Mr. Hohmann took the role of the sender of the communication process by reading specific directions for Mrs. Lundeen to follow. She modeled his message by completing a rectangle drawing. Then students, working in cooperative groups, were given learning packets containing directions for constructing a different figure.

Each cooperative group included three students, one of whom was a special needs student. As the groups constructed their figure, Mr. Hohmann and Mrs. Lundeen circled the room, giving supportive clues when needed. After a specified time, each group turned in their group project, which was compared to a completed model. This exercise

stimulated higher-order thinking, peer support, hands-on experience, and social interaction. Most important, it allowed for all class members, including students with special needs, to gain a clear understanding of the importance of following directions.

A number of training programs advocate the use of a combined consultation/collaboration model (Adamson, Cox, and Schuller 1989). In these cases, a special education teacher may serve both roles, depending on the problem.

Modifying Instruction

Recently I heard a keynote address by Larry Lieberman at the West Virginia Council for Administrators of Special Education Conference, in which he stressed that a major difference between regular education and special education is that regular education is driven by a system-based curriculum, whereas special education is driven by the needs of the individual. Fortunately for the inclusion movement, this dichotomy gradually is disappearing (Smith 1986). Responsible inclusion requires accepting attitudes by parents, teachers, and administrators; increased interactions between students with disabilities and the nondisabled; and realistic performance expectations for all students. But it also may require modifications in curricula, methods of instruction, and materials.

Curricula

An often-heard criticism is that students with special needs will not be able to benefit from the curriculum. If the curriculum is simply a series of lock-step, sequential bits of information delivered through lectures and textbook readings, then the criticism probably is warranted. But the curriculum can be made much more holistic and personalized by recognizing not only what students need, but also what they already know. Classrooms can become exciting places where group projects and activity centers make the curriculum meaningful

for each student. And each student does not have to learn the same things in the same ways.

For example, a third-grade class is doing a science unit dealing with temperature. Most of the students are learning to use Fahrenheit and Celsius scales; a few are learning about molecular movement at different temperatures; and two students are learning to use hot and cold items. There are cooperative group activities and experiments. All students work toward the same basic goal, but individual objectives vary; and all the students benefit from the diversity (Stainback and Stainback 1992).

Methods of Instruction

For the most part, instructional methods used by special educators can be equally effective with general students, and methods used by general teachers can be equally effective with students with disabilities. Good teaching methods have no boundaries. Although an inclusive classroom does focus on the individual, there are some generalized instructional modifications that are especially suited to students with learning problems. These include using advanced organizers, preteaching key vocabulary, providing repetition of instruction, previewing major concepts, making time adjustments, using manipulatives, and providing corrective feedback. Cooperative groups, peer tutoring, whole-language instruction, unit teaching, and behavior modification procedures all have received support in the literature.

Emphasizing how to learn, rather than just what to learn, is important. A learning-strategies approach fits this goal. For example, students who have difficulty remembering what they read may be taught a paraphrasing strategy called RAP, developed by Jean Schumaker, Pegi Denton, and Don Deshler (1984) at the University of Kansas. The mnemonic RAP stands for:

Read the paragraph.
Ask yourself, What is the main idea? Give two details.
Put it into your own words.

Many inclusive schools are teaching such strategies in regular and elective classes. Any student who has difficulty learning is encouraged to take them. In some cases, strategy training is written into a student's IEP. (For a review of learning strategies, see fastback 345 *Learning Strategies for Problem Learners*.)

Another method that has become popular for use with integrated students who have unusual or severe disabilities is called MAPS (McGill Action Planning System), described by Forest and Pearpoint (1992). MAPS is a collaborative process that brings together key people in the student's life to create an action plan to be used in the regular classroom. Vandercook, York, and Forest (1989) provide specific examples of the effective use of MAPS.

Materials

Special teachers and regular teachers may need to locate lower- or higher-level textbooks to meet diverse student learning needs. Although it is time-consuming, many special teachers working as consultant-collaborators redesign materials to retain the original concepts but modify wording and problems in order to better match students' abilities.

Computer-based instruction can allow students with disabilities to be more independent in regular classes. Although a student with a physical disability may not be able to write with a pencil, the student can participate in the regular writing lesson by using the computer as a prosthesis. Students who are unable to read may soon be able to have entire pages read to them using scanners, synthesizers, and special software with a computer. Until such technology is available, teachers may be legally responsible for reading aloud such things as tests. For example, when history teacher Michael Withers refused to give tests orally to a disabled student, the parents sued. The jury ruled in favor of the parents and held Withers liable for compensatory damages, punitive damages, court costs, and attorney's fees (Zirkel 1994).

Lynne Chalmers (1992) provides a variety of suggestions for modifying materials and reformatting worksheets. For example, she suggests using large amounts of visual spacing, breaking worksheets into several sections, limiting the types of questions, providing clear directions and numerous examples, and giving cues for answers.

Inclusion Checklists

The following checklists for administrators, teachers, and parents reflect an inclusion philosophy. Each checklist has 10 questions. The more "yes" answers, the more positive toward responsible inclusion is the respondent.

Administrator Checklist

1. Does your school mission statement embody the belief that all students can learn and respect individual differences?
2. Would the students with disabilities at your school attend this school even if they were not disabled?
3. Do you encourage your regular teachers to accept students with disabilities in their classes?
4. Do you allow time and flexible scheduling so that special and regular teachers can consult and collaborate?
5. Do you recommend students with disabilities for placement based on their individual needs, rather than on categorical labels?
6. Do you promote social integration of disabled and nondisabled classmates through school dances, clubs, athletic events, and other activities?
7. Do you promote physical integration of disabled and nondisabled classmates in homeroom assignments, lunch schedules, locker locations, and other placements?

8. Do you expect students with disabilities who have IEPs to be as successful in reaching their goals as nondisabled students are in reaching their goals?
9. Are related services, such as speech and physical therapy, brought to the student in his home school and program, instead of taking the student to the service?
10. Do you encourage parents of students with disabilities to become active members in such school organizations as the PTA?

Teacher Checklist

1. Are you willing to have age-appropriate students with disabilities in your class?
2. Do you modify your curriculum, instructional methods, and materials to meet the diverse needs of students in your class?
3. Are you open to suggestions and modifications in your teaching and classroom management?
4. Are you willing to share your teaching responsibilities with other professionals?
5. Do you expect disabled students to be as successful in meeting their own goals as nondisabled students are in meeting theirs?
6. Do you call on students with disabilities as much as you call on other students in your class?
7. Do you use heterogeneous grouping?
8. Do you use peer tutoring?
9. Do you use adaptive technology and customized software?
10. Have you attended training sessions about responsible inclusion?

Parent Checklist

1. Does your disabled child attend the same school he or she would have attended if not disabled?

2. Do you take your disabled child to the same social functions you would attend if he or she did not have a disability?
3. Are your rules at home the same for your disabled child as for your other children? (If you have only one child, do you set the same rules that you would establish if the child did not have a disability?)
4. Is your disabled child given specific chores and home responsibilities?
5. Do you encourage your disabled child to participate in social and recreational events with nondisabled peers?
6. If your child is capable of doing so, do you encourage him or her to participate in the development of goals and objectives for his or her IEP?
7. Do you discipline your disabled child without special regard to the disability?
8. Will you allow or provide independent living arrangements for your disabled child as he or she matures?
9. Have you attended meetings at which the education of children with your child's type of disability were discussed?
10. Are you willing to serve on a home-school team to encourage appropriate placement of children with disabilities in responsible inclusion programs?

References

Adamson, D.R.; Cox, J.; and Schuller, J. "Collaboration/Consultation: Bridging the Gap from Resource Room to Regular Classroom." *Teacher Education and Special Education* 12 (Winter/Spring 1989): 52-55.

Affleck, J.Q.; Madge, S.; Adams A.; and Lowenbraun S. "Integrated Classrooms Versus Resource Model: Academic Viability and Effectiveness." *Exceptional Children* 54 (January 1988): 339-48.

Becker, W.C.; Englemann, S.; Carnine, D.; and Rhine, W.R. "Direct Instructional Model." In *Encouraging Cheating in America's Schools: A Decade of Experimentation*, edited by R. Rhine. New York: Academic Press 1981.

Block, M.E., and Moon, M.S. "Orelove, Wehman, & Wood Revisited: An Evaluative Review of Special Olympics Ten Years Later." *Education and Training in Mental Retardation* 27, no. 4 (1992): 379-86.

Chalfant, J.C., and Van Dusen Pysh, M. "Teacher Assistance Teams: Five Descriptive Studies on 96 Teams." *Remedial and Special Education* 10, no. 6 (1989): 49-58.

Chalmers, L. *Modifying Curriculum for the Special Needs Student in the Regular Classroom*. Moorhead, Minn.: Practical Press, 1992.

Corbin, N. "The Impact of Learning Together." *What's Working*. Minnesota Department of Education. (Spring/Summer 1991).

Dunn, L.M. "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded: Is Much of It Justifiable?" *Exceptional Children* 35 (September 1968): 5-22.

First, P.F., and Curcio, J.L. *Implementing the Disabilities Acts: Implications for Educators*. Fastback 360. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1993.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Forest, M., and Pearpoint, J.C. "Putting All Kids on the Map." *Educational Leadership* 50 (October 1992): 26-29.

Frymier, J., and Gansneder, B. "The Phi Delta Kappa Study of Students at Risk." *Phi Delta Kappan* 71 (October 1989): 142-46.

Halvorsen, A.T., and Sailor, W. "Integration of Students with Severe and Profound Disabilities: A Review of the Research." In *Issues and Research in Special Education: Vol. 1*, edited by R. Gaylord-Ross. New York: Teachers College Press, 1990.

Idol-Maestas, L. *Special Educator's Consultation Handbook*. Rockville, Md.: Aspen, 1983.

Katz, J. "Collaborative Learning: How It Works and What It Does." Manuscript. Stony Brook: State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1987.

Lombardi, T.P. *Changing Institutional Structures for Effective Special Education Programs*. Monograph Series No. 4. Tucson: University of Arizona, College of Education, 1971.

Lombardi, T.P. *Learning Strategies for Problem Learners*. Fastback 345. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1992.

Lombardi, T.P.; Nuzzo, D.L.; Kennedy, K.D.; and Foshay, J. "Perceptions of Parents, Teachers and Students Regarding an Integrated Education Inclusion Program." *High School Journal* 77 (April/May 1994): 315-21.

Lombardi, T.P.; Odell, K.S.; and Novotny, D.E. "Special Education and Students at Risk: Report from a National Study." *Remedial and Special Education* 12 (January/February 1991): 56-62.

Piuma, M.F. *Benefits and Cost of Integrating Students with Severe Disabilities into Regular School Programs: A Study Summary of Money Well Spent*. San Francisco: San Francisco State University Department of Special Education, 1989.

Research Triangle Institute. *Educational Approaches and Program Options for Integrating Students with Disabilities: A Decision Tool*. Longmont, Colo.: Sopris West, 1993.

Schumaker, J.B.; Denton, P.H.; and Deshler, D.D. *The Paraphrasing Strategy*. Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1984.

Smith, F. *Insult to Intelligence*. New York: Arbor House, 1986.

Snow, J., and Forest, M. "Circles." In *More Education Integration*, edited by M. Forest. Downsview, Ontario: G. Allan Roeher Institute, 1987.

Stainback, S., and Stainback, W. *Curriculum Considerations in Inclusive Classrooms: Facilitating Learning for All Students*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooke, 1992.

Valesky, T.C., and Hirth, M.A. "Survey of the States: Special Education Knowledge Requirements of School Administrators." *Exceptional Children* 58 (March/April 1992): 399-406.

Vandercook, T.; York, J.; and Forest, M. "The McGill Action Planning System: A Strategy for Building the Vision." *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps* 14, no. 3 (1989): 205-15.

White, W.A.T. "A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Direct Instruction in Special Education." *Association for Direct Instruction News* 7, no. 4 (1988).

Zirkel, P.A. "Costly Lack of Accommodations." *Phi Delta Kappan* 75 (April 1994): 652-53.

Phi Delta Kappa Fastbacks

Two annual series, published each spring and fall, offer fastbacks on a wide range of educational topics. Each fastback is intended to be a focused, authoritative treatment of a topic of current interest to educators and other readers. Several hundred fastbacks have been published since the program began in 1972, many of which are still in print. Among the topics are:

Administration
Adult Education
The Arts
At-Risk Students
Careers
Censorship
Community Involvement
Computers
Curriculum
Decision Making
Dropout Prevention
Foreign Study
Gifted and Talented
Legal Issues
Mainstreaming
Multiculturalism
Nutrition
Parent Involvement
School Choice
School Safety
Special Education
Staff Development
Teacher Training
Teaching Methods
Urban Education
Values
Vocational Education
Writing

For a current listing of available fastbacks and other publications of the Educational Foundation, please contact Phi Delta Kappa, 408 N. Union, P.O. Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402-0789, or (812) 339-1156.

Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation

The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation was established on 13 October 1966 with the signing, by Dr. George H. Reavis, of the irrevocable trust agreement creating the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation Trust.

George H. Reavis (1883-1970) entered the education profession after graduating from Warrensburg Missouri State Teachers College in 1906 and the University of Missouri in 1911. He went on to earn an M.A. and a Ph.D. at Columbia University. Dr. Reavis served as assistant superintendent of schools in Maryland and dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh. In 1929 he was appointed director of instruction for the Ohio State Department of Education. But it was as assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction in the Cincinnati public schools (1939-48) that he rose to national prominence.

Dr. Reavis' dream for the Educational Foundation was to make it possible for seasoned educators to write and publish the wisdom they had acquired over a lifetime of professional activity. He wanted educators and the general public to "better understand (1) the nature of the educative process and (2) the relation of education to human welfare."

The Phi Delta Kappa fastbacks were begun in 1972. These publications, along with monographs and books on a wide range of topics related to education, are the realization of that dream.